

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner's Comments

1. As to Claims 1-20, the claim language: "capable of ..." renders the functionality to be optional. Therefore, even though the Examiner gave the functionality patentable weight, the recited functionalities is not required to be taught by the cited prior art of record, only capable of executing the claimed functionalities. Applicant is advised to remove "capable of..." language and have the functionalities positively recited.

Response to Amendment

2. Acknowledgement is made that Claims 1, 14-15, and 19-20 have been amended and are now pending with Claims 2-13 and 16-18 of the instant application.
3. Amendments to Claim 1 in response to examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st has been considered. The amendment obviates previously raised rejection, as such this objection hereby withdrawn.
4. Amendments to Claim 14 in response to examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st has been considered. The amendment obviates previously raised rejection, as such this objection hereby withdrawn.
5. Amendments to Claim 20 in response to examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st has been considered. The amendment obviates previously raised rejection, as such this objection hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

6. As per Pages 7-8, Applicants submit general arguments to the Office Action dated **10 November 2009**. Specifically, with respect to Claims 1 which will be addressed below.

7. As per **Claim 1**, Applicants state that the Examiner has quoted the proper section of Applicant's application (par [0014]) but has failed to understand how the present invention and Hartley differ the limitation of the present invention where "Agents integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User". The present invention is focused on the "Agent" grouping and associating selected Service Providers to in a sense, create their "team". It is then the Agent who provides the services to the end user, using the Service Providers. There is no direct link in the present invention between Service Providers and end users as there is a middle party, the Agent, providing a business channel between the parties. Hartley at paragraphs 22-25, 27, 29-31 teaches a "specialist", which is no more than the person answer the phone as at a call center. Paragraph 22 states this specifically: "FIG. 1, a communication network 10 adapted to enable a specialist (e.g., at call center 30) to receive a request from an individual for assistance regarding a personal need is provided. Means (e.g., a personal computer 40) are provided for creating a personalized web page in response to the request." Hartley does not teach **an Agent who can create their own "team" of specialist, and who interacts with the User to assist them in obtaining advice or answers.**

In further, Applicants argue that Examiners association of "Agents" with "Specialists" is completely incorrect. Applicants explicitly argue that the "Specialists" in Hartley may transfer a caller/user to each other, but **do not have the ability to create a team or subgroup**, and even if they did, they would be part of the subgroup as a specialist.

Furthermore, Applicants state that Examiner on page 10 of Office Action dated **10 November 2009** states: "Hartley does not explicitly teach the final step of: connecting said user with said service provider if available", and this is because in Hartley the "specialists" are the "Service Providers" and there are no "Agents" taught or suggested by Hartley. Applicants allege that when a user calls in Hartley, the first are connected with an operator who merely determines their eligibility then the user is forwarded to a specialist to assist them, therefore does not disclose the Agent feature of the present invention. On page 13, Applicants argue that Hartley does not teach an Agent who can create their own "team" of specialist, and who interacts with the User to assist them in obtaining advice or answers. On page 11, Applicants argue that the Examiner's association with "Agents" with "Specialists" is completely incorrect. Applicants explicitly argue that the "specialists" in Hartley may transfer a caller/user to each other, but they do not have the ability to create a team or subgroup. Applicants also argue that Hartley does not teach the Agent feature of the present invention. Furthermore, Applicants disagree that Laurie 1 teaches enabling Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User and having a User initiate contact with a Service Provider via

Art Unit: 2451

an Agent's specialized website. Applicants allege that the present invention creates an "Agent" who can select a number of Service Providers and create a custom website where they may group or organize a more specific selection of service providers for a User to browse.

As to the statements and arguments above, Examiner fails to see wherein the last office action dated **10 November 2009** quotes Applicant's disclosure at paragraph 14 as stated by Applicants. In any case, in response to applicant's arguments above that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **an Agent who can create their own "team" of specialist, and who interacts with the User to assist them in obtaining advice or answers**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, Examiner fails to see these features being recited in Specification.

Applicant's statement in that Hartley does not explicitly teach the final step of: connecting said user with said service provider **if available**, is believed to have been misconstrued by Applicant. Hartley teaches, specifically in par [0054], that the specialist (agent) would refer the employee (user) to the appropriate contact (service provider) or **connect the employee directly via warm telephone transfer**. Hartley is only silent in checking to see if the service provider is available. However, Lurie 1 connecting a User with a Service Provider

if available (e.g., the system conferences the two phone calls together, enabling services to be rendered in a live conversation, par [0088]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 1 in the teachings of Hartley to connect a User to their desired Service Provider in real-time when available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Hartley and Lurie 1 to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie 1: pars [0006-0007]).

Examiner notes, that Applicant admits on page 14, at lines 11-13, that at pars [0024-0054], Hartley teaches searching and grouping various service providers and the setting up of a service providers website for viewing by a customer, but does not disclose, teach, or suggest, the Agent feature of the present invention. Therefore, applicants appear to admit that Hartley clearly teaches the argued limitation of: "...enabling the one or more Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User". As to the argued Agent feature, it merely amounts to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Furthermore, as to applicants arguments that Laurie 1 fails to teach enabling Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their

Art Unit: 2451

own specialized websites for browsing by a User and having a User initiate contact with a Service Provider via an Agent's specialized website. Applicants allege that the present invention creates an "Agent" who can select a number of Service Providers and create a custom website where they may group or organize a more specific selection of service providers for a User to browse.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Examiner relies on Hartley to teach the limitation: "...enabling the one or more Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User..." (see page 1 of Office Action at item 19, **10 November 2009** which has clearly been acknowledge by Applicants in their remarks (see page 14, at lines 11-13).

8. As per **Claims 2-13**, Applicant's arguments, pages 16-18 of Remarks, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the same reasons discussed above.

9. As per **Claim 14**, Applicants argue on page 18, lines 7-10 and page 19, lines 8-11, that Laurie 1 fails to teach the step of distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider.

As to the arguments above, Examiner agrees that Laurie 1 is silent in teaching the step of distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider. However, Examiner directs

Art Unit: 2451

Applicants to pages 17-20 of the last Office Action dated **10 November 2009**, specifically pages 20-21, Examiner relies on Rigole (US 7,139,728) to teach the step of distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider (e.g., files that a Service Provider desires to make available to its consumers, may be uploaded in HTML to the Interchange Party Communication System having means of presenting user interfaces to consumer computer systems displaying services being offered by Service Providers, col.16, lines 61-67 and col.17, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Rigole in the combined teachings to enable the Service Providers to properly distribute the HTML code to the Agent to present to the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings to allow the service providers to dynamically present their services on a website to fit the unique nature of each of the individual users of the system (Rigole: col.1, lines 53-67, and col.2, lines 1-10).

10. As per **Claim 15**, Examiner notes that it appears that Applicants have made a typo in page 19, line 15 "09/24/2009". Examiner disregards this typo for the purposes of advancing prosecution, and is hereby acknowledged again by Examiner that the Application's effective filing date is 09/24/2004. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 15, in that Hackworth fails to teach the limitation "Agents integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own

specialized websites for browsing by a User". The present invention is focused on the "Agent" grouping and associating selected Service Providers to in a sense, create their "team".

As to the arguments above, Examiner directs Applicants to pages 18-19 of the previous Office Action date **10 November 2009**, Examiner relies on Faber 1 to teach the limitation of "Agents integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User" (col.4, lines 31-67, col.5, lines 1-22, and col.8, lines 27-57). In further, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., wherein the on the "Agent" grouping and associating selected Service Providers to in a sense, create their "team") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As to Applicant's arguments above in regards to Hackworth teaching the steps of "Having an agent account..." and "assigning an Agent account", have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection in view of the newly discovered references below.

Also, Applicants argue that Laurie 1 teaches a method for expert service providers to provide advice services through unique empowered independent agents to consumers comprising the steps of a User initiating contact with a Service Provider and connecting said User with Service Provider if available and

Art Unit: 2451

enabling Agents to integrate their selected plurality of service providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User and having a User initiate contact with a Service Provider via an Agent's specialized website. Applicants further argue that the present invention creates an "Agent" who can select a number of Service Providers and create a custom website where they may group or organize a more specific selection of Service Providers for a User to browse.

As to Applicant's arguments above, Examiner directs Applicants to the rebuttal to Arguments for Claim 1 above (see item 6), which rebuts to arguments substantially similar as Claim 14. In further in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., creates an "Agent" who can select a number of Service Providers and create a custom website where they may group or organize a more specific selection of Service Providers for a User to browse) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In further, applicants note on page 23, lines 9-13, that Examiner makes no reference to Satoh on page 18 of the Previous Office Action dates **10 November 2009**. In further, Applicant's explicitly argue on page 18, lines 20-22 that Satoh does not teach a plurality of "agents" acting in any manner that suggests, teaches or resembles that taught by the present invention. Furthermore, on page 24, Applicants argue that Satoh does not teach a group of "Agents: creating their

own collections of Service Providers and the Agents themselves acting to bring the two parties together.

As to the arguments above, Examiner notes error in not referencing Satoh in heading at item 25 on Page 17 of the Office Action dated **10 November 2009**. In regards to applicants arguments that Satoh does not teach a plurality of "agents" acting in any manner that suggests, teaches or resembles that taught by the present invention, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Furthermore, Applicants arguments that Satoh does not teach a group of "Agents: creating their own collections of Service Providers and the Agents themselves acting to bring the two parties together. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., creating their own collections of Service Providers and the Agents themselves acting to bring the two parties together) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicants claim explicitly recites: "linking all Service Providers under a single Agent ID into one account information". Applicant is reminded that only the broadest reasonable interpretation is given to the Claim limitations.

Furthermore, Applicants argue on page 24 of Remarks, that Examiner makes no reference to Mersky on page 18 of the Previous Office Action dated **10 November 2009**. In further, Applicants argue that Mersky does not teach nor suggest linking all of the service providers under a single Agent ID for the transaction purposes in combination with Hackworth and Satoh, there is no suggestion or teaching to combine, nor would it be obvious to do so as none of the Prior Art teaches the use of Agents, who are essentially creating their own custom workforce with user or service buyers. The prior art does not suggest or teach this connection and merely citing and combining prior art for a transaction system and a service website does not teach or suggest the combination of claim limitations taught by the present invention.

As to the arguments above, applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., essentially creating their own custom workforce with user or service buyers) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in

Art Unit: 2451

light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

11. As per **Claims 16-17**, Applicant's arguments, pages 16-18 of Remarks, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the same reasons discussed above.

12. As per **Claim 18**, Applicants argue that neither citation teaches or suggests an "Agent" providing a plurality of Service Providers to a User for selection. In further, Applicants argue that the citation provided by Examiner does not teach or suggest for said Users to remain in effect on the website of the Agent while navigating and using the system for connecting telephonically to Service Providers, by way of a series of Pop-up windows.

As to the arguments above, Examiner agrees that Lurie is silent in teaching the limitation of: "allowing for said Users to remain in effect on the website of the Agent while navigating and using the system for connection telephonically by way of a series of popup windows. Examiner directs applicants to page 23 of the previous Office Action dated **10 November 2009**, in which Examiner clearly relies on Lund to teach this limitation of allowing for said Users to remain in effect on the website of the Agent while navigating and using the system for connecting telephonically to Service Providers, by way of a series of progressive popup windows (it is a well-known feature, that websites may contain a series of progressive popup windows) (e.g., after a call is answered by a

service provider, a customer may interact with the business website of the service provider, for continuing advertising and shopping during the course of a conversation between the customer and service provider, col.6, lines 53-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lund in the combined prior art teachings to allow users to continually interact with the agent while be connected to the Service Providers. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine all of the prior art teachings to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie 1: pars [0006-0007]). As for the argument above, that neither citation teaches or suggests an "Agent" providing a plurality of Service Providers to a User for selection. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

13. As per **Claim 19**, Applicants note that there is not a mention of Claim 19 until page 24 of the previous Office Action which was listed on Page 17, in page 25 of Remarks. In further, on page 27 of Remarks, Applicants argue that the prior art does not teach or suggest an "Agent" providing a plurality of Service Providers for a User for selection. The present invention creates an "Agent" who can select a number of Service Providers and create a custom website where

Art Unit: 2451

they may group or organize a more specific selection of service providers for a User to browse.

14. As to the arguments above, Examiner directs Applicants to the teachings of Hartley to teach the limitation of enabling said Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers via an Agent's specialized website (pars [0022-0025], [0027], [0029-0031], [0048], [0051] and [0054]). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., invention creates an "Agent" who can select a number of Service Providers and create a custom website where they may group or organize a more specific selection of service providers for a User to browse) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicants claim explicitly recites: "linking all Service Providers under a single Agent ID into one account information".

15. As per **Claim 20**, Applicants argue, in pages 29-31 of Remarks, that the prior art cited by Examiner, Margiloff et al. is improper since the prior art was not available to the public prior to the filing date and prior art date of application and invention. In further, Applicants argue that the claimed invention allows them to "work" for multiple Agents in the system and provide services on behalf of the multiple agents without any potential telephone connection conflict, Specifically, the claimed invention provides efforts and techniques for expert Service

Art Unit: 2451

Providers to provide their service through a multiplicity of independent Agent channels without potential communication device conflict for consumers. In further, Applicants argue that Altberg does not teach the claim limitation: "having recognition across an entire database of Service Provider's telephone numbers including potentially multiple different accounts, of whether a particular service provider's telephone line is busy thereby" which is not addressed by the Examiner in the rejection.

16. As to the arguments above, in which Applicants argue that the Margiloff et al. is improper are not persuasive. Examiner notes that where two applications of different inventive entities are copending, not published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b), and the filing dates differ, a provisional rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on provisional prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be made in the later filed application unless the application has been excluded under 35 U.S.C. 103(c), including the new provisions added by the CREATE Act. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(3) for examination procedure with respect to 35 U.S.C. 103(c). See also MPEP § 706.02(f) for examination procedure in determining when provisional rejections are appropriate. Otherwise the confidential status of unpublished application, or any part thereof, under 35 U.S.C. 122 must be maintained. Such a rejection alerts the applicant that he or she can expect an actual rejection on the same ground if one of the applications issues and also lets applicant know that action must be taken to avoid the rejection. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., expert Service Providers

Art Unit: 2451

to provide their service through a multiplicity of independent Agent channels without potential communication device conflict for consumers) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, as to applicants arguments above Altberg does not teach the claim limitation: "having recognition across an entire database of Service Provider's telephone numbers including potentially multiple different accounts, of whether a particular service provider's telephone line is busy thereby" which is not addressed by the Examiner in the rejection, Examiner respectfully disagrees. because Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Examiner directs Applicants to page 25 of previous Office Action date **10 November 2009** to see where Examiner clearly addresses the argued limitation at hand.

Specification

17. The use of the trademarks COMPUSEVE®, Prodigy®, AMERICAN ONLINE®, AT&T®, Verizon®, MICROSOFT WIDOWS®, MICROSOFT INTERNET EXPLORER, NETSCAPE NAVIGATOR®, LYNX®, AND MOSAIC® has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent

Art Unit: 2451

applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

In the instant case, Applicants on page 9, lines 18-20, recites: "Applicant respectfully submits the following for Replacement Paragraphs for paragraphs 50 and 51 of the specification as submitted..." However, Examiner fails to understand as to why Applicant would want to place the Replacement Paragraphs at pars [0050-0051]. This amendment appears to be erroneous, and it appears that Applicant's intentions are to replace pars [0058-0059].

In any case, applicant's amendment to the specification can not be properly processed as disclosed in 37 CFR 1.121 (h) requires that each section of an amendment document (e.g., amendment to the claims, amendment to the specification, replacement drawings, and remarks) **MUST** begin on a separate sheet. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

16. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to particular machine, or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such

Art Unit: 2451

as an article or material) to a different state or thing. See page 10 of In Re Bilski 88 USPQ2d 1385.

17. The instant claims are neither positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps nor transform underlying subject matter, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. In the instant application, in Claim 1, a method of connecting two parties in real time, the method comprising the steps of:

"registering one or more Service Providers", "registering one or more Agents", "having...", "enabling..." and "connecting..." are broad enough that the claim could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent.

In further, in the instant application, in Claim 15, a method of connecting two parties in real time, the method comprising the steps of:

"registering one or more Service Providers", "registering one or more Agents", "having an Agent account", "assigning...", "having a Service Provider enter said Agent ID when registering as a new Advisor", "linking...", "distributing...", "enabling..." and "connecting..." are broad enough that the claim could be completely performed mentally, verbally or without a machine nor is any transformation apparent.

Claims 2-14 and Claims 16-20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as to at least inheriting the same deficiencies through their dependency to Claims 1 and Claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 1, 6, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber et al. (US 7,308,422) (referred herein after as Faber 1) in further view of Bollay (US 2002/0023000) (referred herein after as Bollay) in further view of Hartley et al. (US 2003/0154097) (referred herein after as Hartley) and in further view of Lurie et al. (US 2003/0115089) (referred herein after as Lurie 1).

Regarding Claim 1, Faber 1 teaches a method of connecting two parties over a phone in real time capable of execution by a computer, the method comprising:

providing a computer capable of executing the method;

registering one or more Service Providers (e.g., service providers register before service providers can offer their services or information through the website, col.4, lines 10-51).

Faber 1 does not explicitly teach the step of:

registering one or more Agents,

However, Bollay in a similar field of endeavor discloses a server that places ads on a public webpage accessible to Internet visitors including the step of:

registering one or more Agents (e.g., advertising display server monitors the Internet for requests from site administrators and advertiser administrators, in response to a request, after validating log-in authenticity, a private page is created for access by an administrator, pars [0026-0027] and [0030]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Bollay in the teachings of Faber to allow agents to be registered on the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber and Bollay to give Agents more secured control over the websites they are registered for.

In further, the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Bollay do not explicitly teach the steps of:

having one or more Agents creating an associated selected plurality of Service Providers;

enabling the one or more Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User; nor

having a User initiate contact with a Service Provider via an Agent's specialized website.

However, Hartley in a similar field of endeavor discloses methods and systems for managing personal feeds including the steps of:

Art Unit: 2451

having one or more Agents (specialists) creating an associated selected plurality of Service Providers (pars [0022-0025], [0027], [0029-0031], [0048], and [0051-0054]);

enabling the one or more Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User (employee) (pars [0022-0025], [0027], [0029-0031], [0048], [0051-0054]);

having a User initiate contact with a Service Provider via an Agent's specialized website (pars [0022-0025], [0027], [0029-0031], [0048], [0051-0054]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Hartley in the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Bollay to allow the Agents using the system to create their own specialized websites. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley in order to satisfy the unique personal needs for each user of the system.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley do not explicitly teach the final step of:

connecting said User with said Service Provider if available.

However, Lurie 1 in a similar field of endeavor discloses an apparatus and method for online advice customer relationship management including the step of:

connecting a User with a Service Provider if available (e.g., the system conferences the two phone calls together, enabling services to be rendered in a live conversation, par [0088]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 1 in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley to connect a User to their desired Service Provider in real-time when available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie 1: pars [0006-0007]).

18. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Bollay in further view of Hartley in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Faber et al. (US 6,865,540) (referred herein after as Faber 2).

Regarding Claim 2, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 do not teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

generating a pop-up window with information about said Service Provider ;
checking to see if the Service Provider is available.

However, Faber 2 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and apparatus for providing group calls via the Internet including the steps of:

generating a pop-up window with information about said Service Provider (col.5, lines 20-50 and *see* fig.3);

checking to see if the Service Provider is available (col.5, lines 20-50, and *see* fig.3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Faber 2 in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 to enable the user of the system to be able to get information of a service provider and seeing if said service provider's availability. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 2 to help match users of the system with the appropriate service providers (Faber 2: col.1, lines 25-31).

Regarding Claim 3, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 2 teach the method as described in claim 2 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

having said pop-up window prompting said User to enter their phone number to make said connection (Faber 2: col.4, lines 50-64, *see* fig.4).

Regarding Claim 4, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 2 teach the method as described in claim 2 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

generating a message for said User in said pop-up window when said Service Provider is not available (Lurie 1: par [0082]).

Regarding Claim 5, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 2 teach the method as described in claim 2 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

allowing said Service Provider to enter their hours of availability (Faber 1: col.8, lines 6-18).

Regarding Claim 6, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 2 teach the method as described in claim 1 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 2 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

displaying said Service Provider's hours of availability within a pop-up window (Lurie 1: pars [0081-0082]).

Regarding Claim 9, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

having a system manage the transaction records for said Agent's Service Providers (Lurie 1: par [0043]).

Regarding Claim 10, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 9 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

including reporting said transaction records (Lurie 1: par [0043] and [0065]).

Regarding Claim 11, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 9 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 further teach the step wherein the method comprises the step of:

calculating the amount due to the Service Provider based on the Service Provider's transactions (Faber 1: col.10, lines 49-53).

Regarding Claim 12, Faber 1 further teaches wherein the method comprises the step of:

paying the Service Provider and the Agent the amount due based on the transactions (Faber 1: col.10, lines 49-53).

Regarding Claim 13, Faber 1 further teaches wherein the method comprises the step of:

assigning an Agent ID number (e.g., user name) to an Agent account (e.g., account(s) on database 310), (Faber 1: col.4, lines 10-21).

22. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Bollay in further view of Hartley in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Lurie et al. (US 7,289,623) (referred herein after as Lurie 2).

Regarding Claim 7, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

denying said connection if a User tries to initiate a connection during the hours said Service Provider is scheduled to be not available.

However, Lurie 2 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for an online speaker patch-through, including the step of:

denying said connection if a User tries to initiate a connection during the hours said Service Provider is scheduled to be not available (col.5, lines 43-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 2 in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 in order to prevent the service seeker from trying to connect to the service provider when the service provider is not available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Lurie 2 to help the service seekers of the system know what service providers are readily available in real-time (Lurie 2: col.1, lines 65-67, and col.2, lines 1-2).

23. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Bollay in further view of Hartley in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Faber et al. (US 2004/0252820) (referred herein after as Faber 3).

Regarding Claim 8, Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 teaches the method as described in Claim 1 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 do not explicitly disclose wherein the method further comprises the step of:

displaying in said a pop-up window that said Service Provider is currently busy on another call if said Service Provider is currently on another system call.

However, Faber 3 in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for arranging a call including the step of:

displaying in said a pop-up window that said Service Provider is currently busy on another call if said Service Provider is currently on another system call (par [0053])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Faber in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 in order to properly notify the service seeker of the system that the Service Provider's is temporarily not available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1/Faber 3 to provide a more user friendly interaction between the users of the system and service providers (Faber 3: par [0003]).

24. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Bollay in further view of Hartley in further view of Lurie 1 and in further view of Rigole (US 7,139,728).

Regarding Claim 14, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above.

The combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent associated with the Service Provider for each newly registered Service Provider associated to the Agent.

However, Rigole in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for online selection of service providers of server accounts including the step of:

distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent associated with the Service Provider for each newly registered Service Provider associated to the Agent. (col.17, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Rigole in the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 to enable the Service Providers to properly distribute the HTML code to the Agent to present to the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Hartley /Lurie 1 and Rigole to allow the service providers to dynamically present there services on a website to fit the unique nature of each of the individual users of the system (Rigole: col.1, lines 53-67, and col.2, lines 1-10).

25. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber1 in further view of Bollay in further view of Satoh in further view of Mersky et al. (US 7,296,003) (referred hereinafter as Mersky) in further view of Rigole in further view of Hartley and yet in further view of Lurie1.

Regarding Claim 15, Faber 1 teaches a method of connecting two parties over a phone in real time capable of execution by a computer, the method comprising:

- providing a computer capable of executing the method;
- registering one or more Service Providers (e.g., service providers register before service providers can offer their services or information through the website, col.4, lines 10-51).

Faber 1 does not explicitly teach the step of:

- registering one or more Agents.

However, Bollay in a similar field of endeavor discloses a server that places ads on a public webpage accessible to Internet visitors including the step of:

- registering one or more Agents (e.g., advertising display server monitors the Internet for requests from site administrators and advertiser administrators, in response to a request, after validating log-in authenticity, a private page is created for access by an administrator, pars [0026-0027] and [0030]); and
- having an Agent account (pars [0026-0027] and [0030]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Bollay in the teachings of Faber to allow agents to be registered on the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber and Bollay to give Agents more secured control over the websites they are registered for.

Art Unit: 2451

The combined teachings of Faber 1 and Bollay do not explicitly teach the steps of:

assigning an Agent ID number to said Agent Account; nor

having a Service Provider enter an Agent ID when registering as a new Advisor; nor

linking all Service Providers under a single Agent ID into one account information.

However, Satoh in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system that enables a mediator server to provide opportunities for individuals to sell and buy services between them including the steps of:

assigning an Agent ID number to said Agent Account (pars [0003], [0077-0097], [0129], and see fig.4 and 7); and

having a Service Provider enter an Agent ID when registering as a new Advisor (e.g., service provider listing, service provider may use the assigned registration number on the provider terminal to obtain access to the website established by the mediator on the mediator server, pars [0003], [0077-0097], [0129], and see fig.4 and 7); and

linking all Service Providers under a single Agent ID into one account information (pars [0003], [0077-0097], [0125-0132], [0135], [0142] and see figs.4, 7-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Satoh in the combined teachings of Faber 1 and Bollay to allow service providers to select the best agent to offer

Art Unit: 2451

their services to potential service purchasers. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh to help service providers can find the service that best fits the need of the service providers (pars [0141-0145]).

In further, the combined teachings of Faber 1/Bollay/Satoh do not explicitly teach wherein the step of linking all Service Providers under a single Agent ID is implemented into **a transaction activity management interface** (emphasis added).

However, Mersky in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and apparatus for facilitating manual payments for transactions conducted over a network including the step of:

linking all Service Providers under a single Agent ID into **a transaction activity management interface** (col.5, lines 35-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Mersky in the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh in order to allow agents to manage transactions occurring between the service providers and service purchasers. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky to simplify and minimize delay in the transactions between service providers and service purchasers.

The combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky do not explicitly teach the step of:

distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider thereby.

However, Rigole in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for online selection of service providers of server accounts including the step of:

distributing the appropriate service HTML code to the Agent for each newly registered Service Provider thereby (e.g., files that a Service Provider desires to make available to its consumers, may be uploaded in HTML to the Interchange Party Communication System having means of presenting user interfaces to consumer computer systems displaying services being offered by Service Providers, col.16, lines 61-67 and col.17, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Rigole in the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky to enable the Service Providers to properly distribute the HTML code to the Agent to present to the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole to allow the service providers to dynamically present there services on a website to fit the unique nature of each of the individual users of the system (Rigole: col.1, lines 53-67, and col.2, lines 1-10).

The combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky do not explicitly teach the step of:

enabling the one or more Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User.

However, Hartley in a similar field of endeavor discloses methods and systems for managing personal feeds including the steps of:

enabling the one or more Agents to integrate their selected plurality of Service Providers into their own specialized websites for browsing by a User (employee) (pars [0022-0025], [0027], [0029-0031], [0048], [0051-0054]);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Hartley in the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole to allow the Agents using the system to create their own specialized websites. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley in order to satisfy the unique personal needs for each user of the system.

The combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley do not explicitly teach the step of:

connecting Users with these Service Providers for expert advice in real time via a telephone connection.

However, Lurie 1 in a similar field of endeavor discloses an apparatus and method for online advice customer relationship management including the step of:

Art Unit: 2451

connecting Users with these Service Providers for expert advice in real time via a telephone connection (e.g., the system conferences the two phone calls together, enabling services to be rendered in a live conversation, par [0088]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 1 in the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley to connect a User to their desired Service Provider in real-time when available. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie 1: pars [0006-0007]).

Regarding Claim 16, Faber 1 further teaches wherein the method further comprises the step of:

displaying within a pop-up window a full list of an Agent's Service Provider's and their individual availability statuses (Faber 1: col.8, lines 22-36 and see fig.6).

Regarding Claim 17, Faber 1 further teaches wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

monitoring how long telephonic connections are maintained between said Users and said Service Providers (Faber 1: col.10, lines 43-53); and deducting from Users' consumer accounts the amounts based upon how long the telephonic connections are maintained (Faber 1: col.10, lines 43-53).

26. Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber1 in further view of Bollay in further view of Satoh in further view of Satoh in further view of Mersky in further view of Rigole in further view of Hartley in further view of Lurie 1 and yet in further view of Lund (US 7,403,947).

Regarding Claim 18, the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 teach the method as described in Claim 15 above.

The combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Lurie1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

allowing for said Users to remain in effect on the website of the Agent while navigating and using the system for connecting telephonically to Service Providers, by way of a series of progressive popup windows.

However, Lund in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and apparatus for providing computer-network related information about a calling party including the steps of:

allowing for said Users to remain in effect on the website of the Agent while navigating and using the system for connecting telephonically to Service

Art Unit: 2451

Providers, by way of a series of progressive popup windows (it is a well-known feature, that websites may contain a series of progressive popup windows) (e.g., after a call is answered by a service provider, a customer may interact with the business website of the service provider, for continuing advertising and shopping during the course of a conversation between the customer and service provider, col.6, lines 53-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lund in the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 to allow users to continually interact with the agent while be connected to the Service Providers. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine all of the teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 /Lund to generate more capital for service providers, and to also provide additional compensation for the systems providing live advice to the customers desiring services from service providers (Lurie 1: pars [0006-0007]).

27. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber 1 in further view of Bollay in further view of Satoh in further view of Mersky in further view of Rigole in further view of Hartley in further view of Lurie 1 and yet in further view of Likourezous et al. (US 7,483,856) (referred herein after Likourezous).

Regarding Claim 19, the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 teach the method as described in Claim 15 above.

The combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Lurie1 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

giving an Agent the option of self-managed payroll responsibility or, a managed payout consisting of (Mersky: col.5, lines 35-67).

The combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 do not explicitly teach the step of:

deducting a pre-determined Agent service fee for each transaction and distributing the pre-determined Agent fee to said Agent's account.

However, Likourezous in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for an electronic auction commerce transaction including the step of:

deducting a pre-determined Agent service fee for each transaction and distributing the pre-determined Agent fee to said Agent's account (col.10, lines 22-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Likourezous in the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 in order to allow the agent to charge a service fee to the service providers. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1

Art Unit: 2451

/Likourezous to avoid delays for the operator of the website in being paid by the service provider (Likourezous: col.3, lines 15-39).

28. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber1 in further view of Bollay in further view of Satoh in further view of Satoh in further view of Mersky in further view of Rigole in further view of Hartley in further view of Lurie1 in further view of Margiloff et al. (US 2005/0240475) and yet in further view of Altberg et al. (US 7,120,235) (referred herein after as Altberg).

Regarding Claim 20, the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 teach the method as described in Claim 15 above.

The combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 further teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

having recognition, across an entire database (database 310) of Service Provider's telephone numbers including potentially multiple different accounts, of whether a particular Service Provider's telephone line is busy thereby (Lurie 1: e.g., real-time availability statuses, par [0082]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lurie 1 in the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley in order to determine if a Service Provider's telephone line is busy. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of

Art Unit: 2451

Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 to help improve awareness of the Service Providers real-time availability to offer services.

The combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 do not explicitly teach wherein the method further comprises the step of:

enabling a Service Provider to register and be part of numerous different Agent groups.

However, Margiloff in a similar field of endeavor discloses systems and methods for universal online advertising including the step of:

enabling a Service Provider to register and be part of numerous different Agent groups (pars [0012-0019]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Margiloff in the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1 to enable the service providers to be able to select from the different Agent groups they want to help advertise their services. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine all of the teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1/Margiloff help optimize a Service Provider's capabilities in strategically advertising their services.

In further, the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1/Margiloff do not explicitly teach the step of:

enabling a Service Provider to register and be part of numerous different Agent groups, **without concern for any potential telephone connection conflict**.

However, Altberg in a similar field of endeavor discloses a method and apparatus to provide pay-per-call performance advertisement including the step of:

not having a concern for any potential telephone connection conflict (emphasis added) (e.g., each advertiser is assigned a unique telephone number, col. 3, lines 40-52, col.4, lines 5-67, col.5, lines 1-4, 15-24, and fig.8A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of in the combined teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1/Margiloff with the teachings of Altberg to avoid conflicts in a telephone connection with the users of the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine all of the teachings of Faber1/Bollay/Satoh/Mersky/Rigole/Hartley /Lurie1/Margiloff/Altberg to allow the Service Providers to provide services simultaneously to multiple users of the system.

Conclusion

Examiner has cited particular paragraphs, columns, and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and

Art Unit: 2451

are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY MEJIA whose telephone number is (571)270-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9:30AM-8:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2451

/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451

/A.M./
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451